

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**1.) Claim Amendments**

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 18. Support for the amendments can be found in at least paragraph [0041] of the present Specification. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 6, 8, 13-14, 18, 23-25, and 30 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1, 6-8, 14, 18, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiche, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196) in view of Inoue, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0034238). While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicant has chosen to respectfully disagree and traverses the rejection as follows. Applicant reserves the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited reference, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 6-8, 14, 18, and 23-25 are patentable because nothing in Reiche and Inoue, taken alone or in any permissible combination, disclose, teach, or even suggest the elements of amended independent claims 1 and 18. For example, nothing in Reiche and Inoue, taken alone or in any permissible combination, disclose, teach, or even suggest “determining if said remote server is authorized to send a second request for access,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Amended claim 18 recites substantially similar elements. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1 and 18 (and all claims dependent therefrom) are patentable over Reiche and Inoue, taken alone or in any permissible combination. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 13 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiche, *et al.* in view of Inoue, *et al.* and further in view of Niemi, *et*

*al.* (RFC 3310, HTTP Digest Authentication Using AKA). Niemi is not cited as disclosing, teaching, or even suggesting any of the elements of amended independent claims 1 or 18. Thus, claims 2, 13, and 30 are patentable over Reiche, Inoue, and Niemi, taken alone or in any permissible combination, at least due to their dependency on amended independent claim 1 or 18. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Ronald S. Liu /

Ronald S. Liu  
Registration No. 64,170

Date: March 14, 2011

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8512  
ronald.liu@ericsson.com